

Nguyen
10/736,274

REMARKS

The undersigned requests a personal interview with the Examiner in charge of this application to discuss issues raised in this amendment and to expedite prosecution of the application.

Claim 1 was objected to because of an informality and has been corrected in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 14 – 15 were indicated to be vague because of the use of the expression “Asian production companies”. The expression has been changed by amending claim 15 to read “production companies located in Asia”. Hopefully, this will overcome the issue raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Thiagarajan 20030196204 in view of Yurt 5,253,275, Lewis 20050198677, Tiemann 20030101457, and further in view of Darbee 6,130,726.

Claims 14-16 were rejected over all of the above references and further in view of Kinema which was cited for the production of films in Asia.

Thiagarajan discloses a multiple media vendor support system in which one or more vendors provide video on demand (VOD). A user has a remote to navigate through an onscreen program guide and locate television shows of interest to the viewer. As indicated in par. 0029, the viewer can look at schedules of current and future programming, view VOD offers, etc. In the present invention, as seen in Fig. 6 and described in page 37 of the specification, the user has a navigation device on the remote, the navigation device having a user input field including multiple content fields which selectively display what data is stored in the storage 17 of the data center 12 (Fig. 3). It is believed that neither this or any of the other references show or suggest such a feature of the present invention.

Yurt has an audio and video transmission and receiving system and was cited for an input for adding to the storage. Actually, conversion means 113 cited by the Examiner

Nguyen
10/736,274

for this feature merely places "the items from source material library 111 into a predetermined format as formatted data" (col. 6, lines 58-64) and thus is only a formatting device. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "new" data is added to the storage to clarify this distinction.

Lewis has a system for data management and on demand rental and purchase of digital data products and was cited for a billing system using a unique pass code obtained for making payment. The undersigned has been unable find this feature in the places identified by the Examiner. The publication does describe the making of payment using a credit card, but that is not the same as receiving a unique pass code which presumably could be used at some future time for receiving a particular movie, for example.

Tiemann shows a system for distributing movies and was cited for a transmission network including a processor, taking the position that the transmission network 532 in Fig. 5b "inherently has a network transmitter and network receiver ... and a processor in order to process relaying of user requests and provided content to appropriate users". The inherence of the processor is not all that clear to the undersigned. Other ways of providing such a service may be available.

Darbee has a program guide on a remote control display and was cited for a remote control device screen showing movies available for screening at the data center. In col. 14, there is described a carousel with a quick view guide which shows the movies either now showing or starting at some time in the future. This is not believed the same as providing a user with descriptive material about all the movies stored for on demand at the data center.

In view of the excellent art cited by the Examiner, parent claim 1 has been amended to call for the navigation device on the remote which has multiple content fields selectively displaying the data stored in the storage of the data center, as discussed above. As pointed out there, it is believed that this important feature of the invention does not appear to be taught or suggested in the applied references.

Nguyen
10/736,274

It is noted that five references have been combined in order to reject claim 1 which is very specific, and, in view of this amendment, is even more specific. When so many references are combined to reject a single claim, this raises the issue as to whether hindsight is involved, that is, it is the teachings of this application which would suggest such a combination of references.

In view of the foregoing, parent claim 1 along with its depending claims clearly distinguish over the applied references and should be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned or Mr. Kroll if further changes are required to obtain allowance of the application.

A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard Belkin/

LEONARD BELKIN

Reg. No. 18,063

Tel 301-254-8549

for

Michael I. Kroll

Reg. No. 26,755

171 Stillwell Lane

Syosset, NY 11791

Tel 516-367-7777

Dated: Oct. 14, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF FAXING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, telephone number 571-272-8300 on Oct. 14, 2008.

/Leonard Belkin/

Leonard Belkin